

**REMARKS**

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 1 and 4 are amended. Claims 7-9 are cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 1-6 are pending and under consideration. No new matter is presented by the claim amendments and accordingly, entry and approval of same are respectfully requested.

**ENTRY OF AMENDMENT UNDER 37 CFR §1.116**

Applicant requests entry of this Rule 116 Response because it is believed that the amendment of claims 1 and 4 puts this application into condition for allowance and should not entail any further search by the Examiner since no new features are being added or no new issues are being raised.

Claim 1 and 4 are amended, using claim 1 as an example, to recite a paper guide "a plurality of at least three second guide ribs . . . with an equal, second interval therebetween each of the adjacent second guide ribs wider than the first interval between the first guide ribs, wherein each of the second guide ribs is connected to a corresponding first guide rib, and ribs do not extend into the interval between the second guide ribs. (See, for example, FIG. 4).

**ITEMS 4-9: REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1-6**

Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Tanaka et al. (U.S.P. 5,515,094), claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Samoto et al. (U.S. 2003/0043248), claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Kanemitsu (JP 2002-103706), claims 4-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tanaka in view of Bae (U.S. 5, 775,824), and claims 4-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unaptenable over Kanemitsu in view of Bae.

The rejections are traversed.

In contrast to the cited art, independent claim 1, as amended, recites a paper guide of an ink-jet printer including "a plurality of at least three second guide ribs positioned to protrude from the paper guide to face a rear-half swath of the printhead with an equal, second interval therebetween each of the adjacent second guide ribs wider than the first interval between the first guide ribs, wherein each of the second guide ribs is connected to a corresponding first guide rib, and ribs do not extend into the interval between the second guide ribs."

In contrast to the cited art, independent claim 4, as amended, recites an ink-jet printer including "a plurality of first guide ribs and a plurality of at least three second guide ribs, wherein the plurality of first guide ribs are positioned to protrude from the paper guide to face a front-half

swath of the printhead with an equal, first interval therebetween, and the plurality of second guide ribs protrude on the paper guide to face a rear-half swath of the printhead with an equal, second interval therebetween each of the adjacent second guide ribs to be wider than the interval between the first guide ribs."

Applicant submits that none of the cited art, alone or in combination, discusses these features. As set forth in MPEP §706.02 entitled Rejection on Prior Art, anticipation requires that the reference must teach every aspect of a claimed invention.

Tanaka does not discuss, for example, a plurality of at least three second guide ribs with an equal, second interval therebetween each of the adjacent second guide ribs.

The Examiner contends that Tanaka discusses:

first ribs 11 and two second guide ribs 15 (FIG. 4) . . . such that the spacing between the second guide ribs 15 is wider than the spacing between the first guide ribs 11. The spacing between the first ribs 11 is approximately equal as shown in Figure 4 of Tanaka et al. and there is only one interval of spacing between the two second guide ribs 15 which is of course, equal to itself.

(Action at page 2).

That is, Tanaka merely discusses two second guide ribs with an *arguendo* equal interval therebetween, i.e., the one interval of spacing.

Samoto does not discuss, for example that "ribs do not extend into the interval between the second guide ribs."

The Examiner contends that Samoto discusses:

first ribs are the first half of the ribs 256 and 258 as shown above. The second ribs are the second half of ribs 258.

(Action at page 4).

That is, Samoto discusses ribs that do extend into an interval between the second guide rib. As illustrated in the annotated FIG. 6 of Samoto ribs extend from the first half of ribs 26, i.e. the second half of ribs 256 between the second ribs. (Action at page 4). Further, the annotated FIG. 6 also shows ribs extending between the second ribs that the Examiner has not labeled as either first or second ribs. (Action at page 4).

Applicant submits that Kanemitsu also does not discuss, for example, ribs that do not extend into the interval between the second guide ribs.

Rather, as illustrated in the annotated drawing of Kanemitsu (Action at page 6), unidentified ribs extend in the interval between the second guide ribs.

Regarding, the Examiner's §103 rejection of claims 4-6, as Applicant submits above,

neither Tanaka nor Kanemitsu discuss the paper guide and do not discuss ribs do not extend into the interval between the second guide ribs. As set forth in MPEP §2143.03 "To establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. *In re Royka*, 490 F. 2d 1981, (CCPA 1974)."

### Conclusion

Since features recited by independent claims 1 and 4 (and respective dependent claims) are not discussed by the art relied on by the Examiner, alone or in combination, and *prima facie* obviousness is not established, the rejection should be withdrawn and claims 1-6 allowed.

### CONCLUSION

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: July 15, 2005

By: Paul W. Bobowiec  
Paul W. Bobowiec  
Registration No. 47,431

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 434-1500  
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501